



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.18610 of 2025

M.Rajendran

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Zonal Deputy Thasildar,
Zone II Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Head Surveyor,
Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
4. Bhuvaneswari
5. Bharanitharan
6. Parvatharajkumar
7. Thillaimuthu
8. Jeyanthi
9. Tharani
10. Malarvizhi
11. Diviya



12. Premnath

13. Rohini Devi

14. Tamilkodi

15. Muthukumaran

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent in file No.2025/0103/27/216450 dated 09.06.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1 to 3rd respondents to issue patta to the petitioner in respect of the property in survey No.SF.No.239/2B with an extent of 10 cents situated at Mandapam Village, Ramanathapuram Taluk, Ramanathapuram District as per the civil court decree.

For Petitioner : M/s.R.Paranjothi

For Respondents : Mr.B.Saravanan
Additional Government Pleader
for R1 to R3
Mr.Y.Prakash for R4 to R14

ORDER

An order dated 09.06.2025 of the Tahsildar is challenged *inter alia* on the ground of breach of principles of natural justice.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had succeeded in civil proceedings and that the order of the trial court was affirmed even by the Supreme Court. In those circumstances, learned counsel contends that the impugned order is unsustainable.



WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel for the respondents 4 to 14 submits that a civil suit has been filed by the said respondents in O.S.No.13 of 2025. After pointing out that the said suit is for partition, he submits that no interference is called for with the impugned order.

4. On perusal of the impugned order, the reason for rejection is mentioned as “as per VAO's report court case O.S.No.13 of 2025”. No further particulars are provided with regard to the nature of the VAO's report or the nature of the suit. The said order can be characterised as unreasoned. For such reason, the order cannot be sustained and is hereby set aside. As a consequence, the matter is remanded to the Tahsildar for reconsideration. After providing a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and the respondents 4 to 14, a speaking order shall be issued by the Tahsildar within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

11.11.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
RJR



WEB COPY



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

RJR

To

1. The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Zonal Deputy Thasildar,
Zone II Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Head Surveyor,
Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

W.P.(MD)No.18610 of 2025

11.11.2025